



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

A woman of consequence: Pandora in Hesiod's Works and Days

Citation for published version:

Canevaro, L 2011, 'A woman of consequence: Pandora in Hesiod's Works and Days', *The Cambridge Classical Journal*, vol. 57, no. n/a, pp. 9 - 28. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270500001251>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1017/S1750270500001251](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270500001251)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Published In:

The Cambridge Classical Journal

Publisher Rights Statement:

© Canevaro, L. (2011). A woman of consequence: Pandora in Hesiod's Works and Days. The Cambridge Classical Journal, 57(n/a), 9 - 28. [10.1017/S1750270500001251](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1750270500001251)

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



A WOMAN OF CONSEQUENCE: PANDORA IN HESIOD'S WORKS AND DAYS*

The Pandora myth as told in Hesiod's *Works and Days* (59–105) has been criticised since antiquity as internally inconsistent. In the nineteenth and most of the twentieth century this led editors to propose radical atheses and emendations to resolve the inconsistencies. Although in recent decades the impetus has swung more towards conservative editing,¹ and seemingly endless work has been done on the myth, the passage still has not been fully understood in terms of its purpose within the Hesiodic corpus. In this paper I argue that the 'suspect' lines are perfectly consistent when understood in terms of the intertextual relationship between Hesiod's *Works and Days* and his *Theogony*, a relationship which has been established by scholars such as Jean-Pierre Vernant (1980), Glenn Most (1993) and Jenny Strauss Clay (2003). I argue that, in representing Pandora in *Works and Days*, Hesiod² is engaged in a project of expansion which had its roots in his *Theogony*. Pandora is of more importance to the Iron Age *Works and Days* than to the divine *Theogony*; so she is described in greater detail and becomes more of a prominent figure in her own right. Furthermore, I argue that Hesiod does not stop there, but enacts an expansion of the expansion within *Works and Days* itself, from Zeus' commands to the gods for Pandora's creation at Op. 60–68, to the execution of those commands at 70–80.

I give in full lines 59–80,³ the most problematic passage:

ὥς ἔφατ', ἐκ δ' ἐγέλασσε πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε.
Ἥφαιστον δ' ἐκέλευσε περικλυτὸν ὅτι τάχιστα
γαῖαν ὕδει φύρειν, ἐν δ' ἀνθρώπου θέμεν αὐδὴν
καὶ σθένος, ἀθανάτης δὲ θεῆς εἰς ὧπα εἰσκειν,

60

* I would like to thank my supervisor Barbara Graziosi, the two anonymous referees and the editorial board for their helpful suggestions. I am especially grateful to Ivana Petrovic for stimulating discussion and invaluable comments, and to Mirko Canevaro for unfailing support and advice.

¹ For example West (1978) retains all the 'suspect' lines.

² Throughout this paper 'Hesiod' denotes the persona of the poet of *Theogony* and *Works and Days*, rather than a historical Hesiod – issues such as authorship, performance context, or orality versus writing are necessarily beyond the scope of the present paper.

³ All Hesiod text taken from West's 1966 and 1978 editions of *Theogony* and *Works and Days* respectively, unless stated otherwise. All translations are my own.

παρθενικῆς καλὸν εἶδος ἐπήρατον· αὐτὰρ Ἀθήνην
 ἔργα διδασκῆσαι, πολυδαίδαλον ἰστὸν ὑφαίνειν·
 καὶ χάριν ἀμφιχέαι κεφαλῇ χρυσήν Ἀφροδίτην,
 καὶ πόθον ἀργαλέον καὶ γυιοβόρους μελεδώνας·
 ἐν δὲ θέμεν κύνεόν τε νόον καὶ ἐπὶ κλοπὸν ἦθος
 Ἑρμείην ἦνωγε διάκτορον ἀργειφόντην.
 ὥς ἔφαθ', οἳ δ' ἐπίθοντο Διὶ Κρονίῳ ἀνακτι.
 αὐτίκα δ' ἐκ γαίης πλάσσε κλυτὸς Ἀμφιγυῆεις
 παρθένῳ αἰδοίῃ ἵκελον Κρονίδεω διὰ βουλᾶς·
 ζῶσε δὲ καὶ κόσμησε θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη·
 ἀμφὶ δέ οἱ Χάριτές τε θεαὶ καὶ πότνια Πειθῶ
 ὄρμους χρυσεῖους ἔθεσαν χροῖ, ἀμφὶ δὲ τήν γε
 ὦραι καλλίκομοι στέφον ἄνθεσιν εἰαρινοῖσιν·
 πάντα δέ οἱ χροῖ κόσμον ἐφήρμωσε Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη.
 ἐν δ' ἄρα οἱ στήθεσσι διάκτορος Ἀργειφόντης
 ψεύδεά θ' αἰμυλίου τε λόγους καὶ ἐπὶ κλοπὸν ἦθος
 τεῦξε Διὸς βουλῇσι βαρυκτύπου· ἐν δ' ἄρα φωνήν
 θῆκε θεῶν κήρυξ, ὀνόμνηε δὲ τήνδε γυναῖκα
 Πανδώρην, ὅτι πάντες Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες
 δῶρον ἐδώρησαν, πῆμ' ἀνδράσιν ἀλφιστήσιν.

So he spoke, and he laughed aloud, the father of men and gods. He ordered much-famed Hephaistos to mix earth with water as quickly as possible, and to put in it the voice and strength of a human, and to make it like the immortal goddesses in its appearance, a beautiful, lovely form of a maiden. He ordered Athene to teach her works, to weave richly worked cloth, and golden Aphrodite to pour around her head grace and painful desire and limb-devouring cares; and he ordered Hermes, the messenger, the slayer of Argos, to put in a dog's mind and a thievish nature.

So he spoke, and they obeyed lord Zeus son of Kronos. Immediately the famed Lamé One fabricated out of earth a likeness of a modest maiden, by the plans of the son of Kronos; the goddess bright-eyed Athene girdled and adorned her; the goddesses Graces and revered Persuasion placed golden necklaces all around on her skin; the beautiful-haired Seasons wreathed her all around with spring blossoms; and Pallas Athene fitted all the adornment onto her skin. Then into her

breast the messenger, the slayer of Argos, set lies and wily words and a thievish nature, by the plans of deep-thundering Zeus; and the herald of the gods placed a voice in her, and he named this woman Pandora, since all those who have their homes on Olympus gave her a gift – a woe for men who live on bread.

This passage tells the infamous story of Pandora's creation, enacted by the gods at Zeus' behest, as punishment for Prometheus' deceit. Occurring in the so-called 'mythical' section of *Works and Days*, it follows the myth of Prometheus (42–58) and precedes the myth of the Races (106–201) and the fable of the Hawk and the Nightingale (202–12). Its primary function in the poem is to explain why men in the Iron Age have to work: Hesiod will go on to devote the latter part of his poem to explaining how they should do it.

Although the myth has a crucial role in this essentially Iron Age poem, at the level of detail it is seen as problematic. The most commonly perceived problem is the mismatch between 60–68 and 70–80: Zeus' orders for Pandora's creation and their execution by the gods. This discrepancy is problematic because it seems to contradict 69 ἐπιθόντο 'they obeyed' and 71 Κρονίδεω διὰ βουλᾶς 'according to the plans of the son of Kronos': explicit confirmations of obedience. More gods carry out the instructions than were given them; some gods carry out tasks which were allotted to others; still other gods disappear altogether. To give just one preliminary example: at 65 Aphrodite is given instructions, but at 73–5 these instructions are carried out by the Charites, Peitho and the Horai.

To understand what Hesiod is doing here, it is necessary first to establish the relationship between the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days*. This is defined primarily by narrative chronology, biographical narrative and genre.⁴ In brief: Hesiod constructs a corpus beginning from the dawn of time (Th. 45, 115 ἐξ ἀρχῆς,⁵ 116 πρώτιστα) and stretching to the present day Iron Age (Op. 176 νῦν γὰρ δὴ γένος ἐστὶ σιδήρεον).⁶ He creates a poetic persona which develops from the inexperienced shepherd acting under the Muses' tutelage (Th. 22–3 αἶ νύ ποθ' Ἡσίοδον καλὴν ἐδίδασαν αἰοιδήν,|ἄρνας

⁴ For discussion see especially Most (1993), and more recently Haubold (2010).

⁵ This is a common phrase in poetry, often used to refer to a story which begins from the root of a particular matter. Here Hesiod takes this to the extreme: he will begin from the actual beginning.

⁶ I limit my analysis here to *Theogony* and *Works and Days*, although strictly speaking there is a 'gap' between the two in terms of cosmic chronology: the time of the demi-gods and heroes – filled by the *Catalogue of Women* and, if we were to amalgamate the Hesiodic tradition with the Homeric, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. See further Clay (2003), Graziosi/Haubold (2005).

ποιμαίνονθ') to the wise farmer-poet less dependent on divine instruction⁷ (Op. 656–7 ἔνθά μέ φημι | ὕμνω νικήσαντα φέρειν τρίποδ' ὠτώεντα). He covers all his poetic bases, from theogonic cosmogonic catalogue (Th. 33 ὕμνεϊν μακάρων γένος αἰὲν ἔόντων) to didactic wisdom literature (Op. 10 ἐγὼ δέ κε Πέρση ἐτήτυμα μυθησαίμην).

Much of Hesiodic scholarship has striven to prove the relative compositional chronology of *Theogony* and *Works and Days*,⁸ with *Theogony* naturally emerging as the first enterprise.⁹ This issue was discussed already in antiquity, for example Σ(Op.)Pertusi 48a concludes δῆλον δὲ ὡς προεκδέδοται ἡ Θεογονία (it is clear that the *Theogony* came before). However, whether or not *Theogony* was actually composed before *Works and Days*,¹⁰ what is clear is that the embedded narrative chronology leads them to be interpreted as such.¹¹ Hesiod leaves markers of all kinds – narrative, biographical, stylistic, linguistic – to encourage the audience to conceive *Theogony* and *Works and Days* as a 'diptych'¹² working together, and as a sequence which starts with *Theogony* and ends with *Works and Days*.

This internal relationship begins to be defined already in the proem of *Works and Days* (1–10).¹³ In line 1 Hesiod invokes the Muses just as he did at length in *Theogony* (1–115¹⁴), in accordance with both epic convention (see e.g. Il. 1.1, Od. 1.1., *Catalogue of Women* 2) and their own demands: Th. 34 σφᾶς δ' αὐτὰς πρῶτόν τε καὶ ὕστατον αἰὲν αἰεῖδεν (always sing of us first and last). However, straight after invoking the Muses he ostensibly distances himself from them (10). He asks them to sing of Zeus, while he tells ἐτήτυμα (true things) to his brother Perses, distinguishing between two

⁷ Most (2008) 68 argues that 'given the agricultural content of the *Works and Days*, it is not at all implausible to consider that poem a shepherd's song'. This is certainly a possible interpretation. However, it seems to me that the Hesiod of Op. is more authoritative and knowledgeable in Iron Age matters than the Hesiod of Th., and explicitly 'corrects' or at least adds to parts of Th., implying that he is older, wiser, and presumably more advanced in his livelihood: he is no longer a shepherd, he is now a farmer.

⁸ E.g. Walcot (1961a) 2, (1966).

⁹ With the exception of a small body of scholarship, led by Allen (1915) who dated *Works and Days* earlier than *Theogony* on the (shaky) basis of astronomical deductions.

¹⁰ Even this question is not as clear-cut as it might seem: when considering the compositional chronology of at least partially oral poetry we must also take into account the possibility of recomposition in reperformance. We cannot think in terms of a static text.

¹¹ Interestingly, one fragment of the corpus attributed to Hesiod in antiquity (papyrus P.Oxy. L 3537 recto 3ff. = Testim. 95 Most 2006) seems to give the opposite chronology: it gives a development which begins with the uninspired shepherd's song (Op.), moves through the Muses' inspiration (told in Op., Th. and this fragment), and ends with the inspired poetry (Th., *Catalogue of Women*). See further Most (2008) 64–70.

¹² Clay (2003) 6.

¹³ I give in this paper an overview only of correspondences in the first quarter of the *Works and Days*: it is hoped that this suffices to make the point.

¹⁴ Interestingly, Wickkiser (2010) makes a detailed comparison between Hesiod's transformation from shepherd to poet in the *Theogony* proem, with the *Theogony* narrative of Pandora's creation.

different songs rather than subordinating himself to the Muses as he did in *Theogony*, and as the Homeric narrator does. However, he does not dismiss them entirely: his ἐτήτυμα are resonant of the Muses' ψεύδεα ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα (lies which sound like truths) at Th. 27, and there is a certain amount of cross-over in subject matter as Hesiod himself will also sing of Zeus. In this way, Hesiod asks the Muses to sing a song parallel to his own so that he can have the best of both worlds, achieving poetic autonomy for the most part but keeping his divine information source on hand so he can call upon it when in doubt: for example at 649 Hesiod confesses his ignorance of seafaring (οὔτε τι ναυτιλῆς σεσοφισμένος οὔτε τι νηῶν), so he has to bring the Muses back into the narrative (658).¹⁵ This departure is driven primarily by narrative chronology and by genre; the Muses are not so crucial for this new, distinctly Iron Age, project.

At 11–26 Hesiod emends one of his many *Theogony* genealogies: that of Eris, Strife. At Th. 225–32 there was only one Eris, Ἐρις στυγερή (hateful Strife), here there are two, the Good and the Bad Strife: 11–12 οὐκ ἄρα μόνον ἔην Ἐρίδων γένος, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ γαῖαν | εἰσὶ δύο (there is not only one race of Strifes on the earth, but two). The specification 'there is not only one race of Strifes' implies that one might have thought there was, i.e. 'as I told you before'. The ostensible chronology here is that Hesiod is now wiser than as poet of *Theogony*, so he can be more accurate and can 'correct' previous mistakes.¹⁶ He is no longer a mouthpiece of the Muses, speaking of the divine realm, but a poet of the Iron Age; he can see mankind's situation clearly. Indeed, this distinction between the divine and the human spheres is pertinent to the correction: Strife is always bad for the gods because competition on Olympus is never healthy but always results in power struggles, whereas for men it can be either bad or good, because men work. This could even be interpreted on a meta-poetic level, with Hesiod exemplifying the Good Eris which he praises by competing with himself as author of *Theogony*, in stark contrast to his brother Perses (*Works and Days*' primary explicit addressee) who epitomises the Bad Eris.¹⁷ The abrupt introduction of this material is also indicative of the embedded narrative chronology, as it assumes prior knowledge of *Theogony*.

¹⁵ Most (2006) xxiii argues that this confession reminds the audience that Hesiod 'is still the very same divinely inspired poet who composed the *Theogony*'. This is true, but more prominent in the biographical chronology is (as Most also notes) that, by implicit contrast, 'on every other matter that he discusses in this poem his views are based upon extensive personal experiences' – this certainly cannot be said of *Theogony*, and shows a greater degree of poetic independence.

¹⁶ N.B. Th. 27–8 ἴδμεν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα, ἴδμεν δ' εὖτ' ἐθέλωμεν, ἀληθέα γηρύσασθαι. This highly debated line could go some way towards justifying Hesiod's 'correction' of *Theogony*, given that the Muses themselves admit that they do not always speak the truth. As a point of interest, Pucci (2009) 62 compares the Muses who lie, with Pandora's deceptive appearance.

¹⁷ One of the anonymous readers of this paper kindly drew my attention to Pseudo-Longinus' use of Hesiod's Good Eris to describe later authors striving with Homer at Subl. 13.2–4.

In the myth of the Races (106–201) there are further hints at the relationship between *Theogony* and *Works and Days*. Although the chronologies are fundamentally incompatible because mankind's creation is taken as understood in *Theogony*, Hesiod makes an attempt at co-ordination between the Races of man and the divine succession of *Theogony*. The Golden Race is created in the time of Kronos (111), but Zeus creates the Bronze Race (143) and the Race of Heroes¹⁸ (158), and will destroy the Iron Race (180). Zeus also makes the Golden Race δαίμονες (122), so we must assume that Zeus has come to power some time during the Golden Age.¹⁹ In his description of the Bronze Race (143–55) Hesiod employs far more language found also in *Theogony* than he does elsewhere in the myth of the Races;²⁰ this could be because he finds more similarities between this most brutish of Races and his *Theogony* gods, at their most brutal moments no less (147 the castration of Ouranos, 148–49 the Hundred-Handers and the Titanomachy), than with mankind.

Throughout *Works and Days* there are words, phrases and whole lines in common with *Theogony*. However, no passage is as striking in this respect as the myths of Prometheus (Op. 42–58, Th. 534–69) and Pandora (Op. 59–105, Th. 570–601²¹). There are adapted lines, for example the Woman's creation in *Theogony* is announced with αὐτίκα δ' ἄντι πυρὸς τεύξεν κακὸν ἀνθρώποισι· | γαίης γὰρ σύμπλασσε περικλυτὸς Ἀμφιγυήεις (Th. 570–71 Immediately he contrived an evil for men in exchange for fire. For the famed Lame One formed from earth...), and at the corresponding point of the *Works and Days* version we have a shorter version of these lines: αὐτίκα δ' ἐκ γαίης πλάσσε κλυτὸς Ἀμφιγυήεις (70 Immediately the famed Lame One formed from earth...). There are very similar lines, for example Op. 53–4 would be identical to Th. 558–9 were it not for the difference between μέγ' ὀχθήσας at Th. 558 and χολωσάμενος at Op. 53.²² There are even identical lines: Op. 71–2 and Th. 572–3. With all of these similarities, we cannot help but consider the two versions in tandem.

Two aspects of comparison are crucial to my analysis. First, the relative proportions of Op. 42–105 and Th. 534–601: *Theogony* gives Prometheus 34 lines, but the Woman/Wife only 29; *Works and Days* instead leaves Pandora 46 lines, but Prometheus

¹⁸ The fragmentary lines 173a–e, in which Kronos is said to return to rule the Heroes' Isles of the Blessed, are clearly spurious.

¹⁹ West on 122 instead explains this as 'A feature of the world as it is now is naturally ascribed to Zeus' will, not to Kronos': this divergence from the chronological framework is, however, unnecessary, especially since we need to pinpoint a progression from Kronos to Zeus.

²⁰ 145 μελιᾶν (Th. 187, 563); 147 ἥσθιον (Th. 524, 773); ἀδάμαντος (Th. 161, 188, 239); 148 ἄπλαστοι (Th. 151); 149 = Th. 152, 673; 148 βίη καὶ χεῖρες (Th. 649); 153 κρυεροῦ (Th. 657).

²¹ N.B. in *Theogony* she is never named, so should properly be referred to simply as the 'Woman' or 'Wife'.

²² The version in Op. is explicable given the use of χολωσάμενος also at 47.

just 17. Second, the use of allusion in the two passages. As Vernant noted,²³ each version alludes to episodes given in full in the other. Prometheus' sacrifice trick is narrated fully at Th. 536–7 but is only alluded to in *Works and Days*: ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς ἔκρυψε, χολωσάμενος φρεσὶν ἥσιν, | ὅττι μιν ἐξαπάτησε Προμηθεὺς ἀγκυλομήτης (47–8 But Zeus concealed [fire], angry in his heart because crooked-counselled Prometheus deceived him). Epimetheus' acceptance of Pandora is described in full at *Works and Days* 85–9, but in *Theogony* is reduced to the minimal comment πρῶτος γάρ ῥα Διὸς πλαστήν ὑπέδεκτο γυναῖκα | παρθένον (Th. 513–14 He was the one who first received Zeus' fabricated woman, the maiden). In *Works and Days* genealogies of characters already featured in *Theogony* are omitted: Op. 84, Epimetheus' first appearance in *Works and Days*, does not make explicit that Epimetheus is Prometheus' brother, but their genealogy as sons of Iapetus and Clymene is given at Th. 507–14. One explanation for these allusions is that Hesiod was drawing from a pre-existing Promethean myth.²⁴ Certainly, not all the elliptical lines in one poem are explained in the other, for example the 'division' between gods and men at Mekone (Th. 535–6) is never elaborated in *Works and Days*, and without a common ancestor the first composition would be lacking without the second to explain its allusions. This common model, then, would provide the background knowledge needed by an audience to fill the gaps; it would also explain the many shared lines.

However, whether or not this was the case (whether Hesiod was selecting details from a pre-existing myth or from his own imagination, and whether or not these choices would have confused an original audience of his first poem), what is clear is that the organisation of the allusions is such that the Prometheus story is consistently abbreviated in *Works and Days*, and the Pandora myth is abbreviated in *Theogony*. This fits with the results of the proportional comparison, which showed that Prometheus is the focus of the *Theogony* version and Pandora that of the *Works and Days*.

This organisation and relative emphasis is driven by the focus of *Theogony* and *Works and Days* respectively.²⁵ Prometheus is of more importance to *Theogony* because throughout the poem the focus is on gods and the perspective is that of the gods. Prometheus is himself son of a Titan (Th. 134); his divine punishment is described at Th. 521–5 and again at Th. 615–16; this particular myth is included to mark the

²³ Vernant (1980) 168 – also e.g. Most (1993) 89–90.

²⁴ As argued by e.g. Heitsch (1963), Mondi (1986) 26.

²⁵ Most (1993) 81 comes to a similar conclusion, albeit through quite different argumentation: that 'there is no original "true" version which is later contradicted or corrected, but rather two equivalent versions, each one as well adapted as possible to the needs of its argumentational environment'.

beginning of the separation between gods and men (Th. 535 καὶ γὰρ ὅτ' ἐκρίνοντο θεοὶ θνητοί τ' ἄνθρωποι). In *Works and Days*, however, the two stories are included primarily to explain why mankind must work (47–8), so Pandora is crucial because of her responsibility for the human condition in the Iron Age. She epitomises the 'male dilemma':²⁶ sexual desire²⁷ vs. economic stability; family continuity vs. problems of property and inheritance;²⁸ the intractable human institution of marriage. Women consume resources (373–5) and increase the need for livelihood.²⁹ Thus the Pandora myth in *Works and Days* should be understood as an elaboration of *Theogony*, emphasising Woman's impact on mankind.

As the Pandora myth is elaborated, so is the figure of Pandora herself. In *Theogony* the Woman/Wife is left nameless, because not all the gods have contributed to her creation so she does not yet deserve the name; in *Works and Days* she is given the name Pandora. As most recently Wickkiser (2010) argues, the *Theogony* Woman is more statue than human, whereas *Works and Days* Pandora is more animated. In *Theogony* she poses a threat only in so much as she creates Women who in turn threaten men's livelihood, drain their resources, and bring that terrible bane, Marriage; in *Works and Days* Pandora poses this threat herself. In this way, the Woman in *Theogony* in comparison with Pandora in *Works and Days* is conceptualised as almost tangential to Zeus' punishment: its catalyst. This sidelining is reinforced by the focus on the Woman's headdress in *Theogony*, which contrasts with the focus on Pandora herself in *Works and Days*. The Woman has both a garland of flowers and a golden diadem, the combination of which 'with its doubling of the natural and the artificial, of nature and culture, would seem the perfect emblem of the Woman/Wife herself and the marital institution she embodies'.³⁰ Key here is the diadem:³¹ it is made by Hephaistos, as all good ekphrastic items should be,³² it is described at some length, and with its

²⁶ Brown (1997) 26. Blümer (2001) vol. 2 goes even further, arguing that Pandora is not the first woman but wickedness personified.

²⁷ Op. 66 πόθον – this and γυιοκόρους (or γυιοκόρους, should we accept the variant) and μελεδώνας in this line are words not used elsewhere in Hesiod: Pandora initiates a new kind of longing, never before experienced by men. It is 'the longing felt by a man because of her, not longing felt by her; but it is treated as an attribute of hers' (West *ad loc.*).

²⁸ Clay (2003) 120

²⁹ βίος is a recurrent concern: Op. 31, 42, 232, 316, 501, 577, 601, 634, 689.

³⁰ Clay (2003) 120.

³¹ For further discussion see Brown (1997) 29, Marquardt (1982) 287.

³² See e.g. the Shield of Heracles (poem attributed to Hesiod), the Shield of Achilles Hom. Il. 18.468–608 (note the similarities with Hesiod's double vignette of the Just and Unjust Cities Op. 212–85), and Hephaistos' attendants at Il. 18.419–20 (described in a very similar way to Pandora in *Works and Days*: νόος Op. 67, Il. 18.419; αὐδὴ Op. 61, Il. 18.419; σθένος Op. 62, Il. 18.420; ἔργα Op. 64, Il. 18.420).

depiction of terrible monsters of land and sea (582 κνώδαλ' ὅσ' ἤπειρος δεινὰ τρέφει ἡδὲ θάλασσα) it is this, not the woman herself as in *Works and Days*, which is indicative of her threat. Interestingly, textual difficulties with this passage have also been posited on the basis of the 'excess' of the adornment:³³ however, the adornment here (a καλὸν κακόν in its own right) both entices Epimetheus and encapsulates the Woman's threat, thus fulfilling the same role as does Pandora herself in *Works and Days*, and so must be elaborated accordingly. This impression of tangentiality is furthered by the use of a simile at 594–9,³⁴ an essentially indirect narrative form, in which women, who consume men's resources, are compared with drones devouring the fruits of worker bees' labour. In this way, the emphasis on Pandora in *Works and Days* in comparison with *Theogony* is enacted not just through longer description, but through the details of that description.

Furthermore, I argue that Hesiod does not stop there, but enacts an expansion of the expansion within *Works and Days* itself. The passages in question here are *Op.* 60–68 and 70–80. In the first Zeus gives orders for Pandora's creation and adornment to Hephaistos, Athene, Aphrodite and Hermes; in the second the gods carry out his orders. The problem is that, despite the indications of obedience already noted, there are discrepancies between the commands and their execution. We would expect the details of the commands to be repeated in their execution (as closely as the shift from indirect command to direct action will allow), however they are altered and added to. These discrepancies (as well as other factors such as uneven attestation in ancient sources: 70–72 omitted by Origen) have led many scholars to criticise or expunge the lines,³⁵ for example lines 70–82 were deleted by Twisten, Lendle;³⁶ 69–82 by Kirchhoff,

³³ E.g. Solmsen brackets 578–84 in the OCT.

³⁴ For discussion see Sussman (1978), although where she tends towards historical anthropology I would argue that Hesiod's 'misogyny' has its roots in his self-sufficient ideals – the farmer should put his trust in others only in so far as they are of use to his labour, so women (see e.g. *Op.* 373–5) should be treated with caution because they pose a risk to productivity.

³⁵ Some scholars have tried, some more dismissively than others, to explain the discrepancies: e.g. Wolkow (2007) puts them down to poetic variation. Walcott (1961a) 16–19 attributes the difference to Hesiod's 'break with the rigidity of the oral tradition' i.e. that *Works and Days* was affected by writing. Brown (1997) 30 claims 'This technique enables him to draw attention to the contrasts between the malicious intention behind the gift...and the attractive façade behind which divine cunning succeeds in hiding it' – unfortunately all he has to say on the textual difficulties is the note 'Some editors delete parts of *Op.* 59–82, but they are wrong'. Rowe (1983) 129–30 (followed by e.g. Arrighetti 1998:411) suggests that Hesiod is describing the same things from different aspects. In my opinion the best explanations are those of Solmsen (1949) 78 n.12 and Rowe (1983) 129 who at least recognise the theme of expansion.

³⁶ Lendle (1957) 22–6 gives collected views of critics of 70–80.

Lisco, Wilamowitz. Other scholars have proposed complicated transmissional hypotheses, e.g. Lehrs attributes the lines to a different recension of the *Theogony* version. In recent decades editors have become more inclined to preserve the text – however, West himself dismisses the differences with the comment ‘nothing is more natural than that Hesiod himself, on coming to describe the gods at work, should slip back into that [his *Theogony*] version’. I aim to show that these ‘reconstructive’ attempts are unnecessary, and the dismissive approaches unsatisfactory,³⁷ as the differences are all explicable in terms of an elaborative project which had its basis in the relationship between *Theogony* and *Works and Days*, and which now continues within *Works and Days*.

First, the additions: in *Theogony* two gods make and adorn Pandora (Th. 571–3), at *Works and Days* 60–68 four gods are trusted with her creation, at 70–80 six (sets of) gods undertake the task – a very neat increase which emphasises her elevated importance. Furthermore, the number is upped once again in line 81 when all the gods give her a gift: this apparent discrepancy (between the six gods named as contributors and 81 πάντες) functions as the ultimate elaboration. Second, the alterations: narratologically, the divergences between Zeus’ commands and their execution by the gods emphasise that, although they act according to Zeus’ plans (71), the gods also add their own flair; they all creatively contribute to ‘Pandora’.

At 65 Aphrodite is given instructions, at 73–5 her instructions are carried out by the Charites, Peitho and the Horai. Editors have tried to resolve this apparent ‘problem’, for example Goettling would replace 76 Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη with δῖ’ Ἀφροδίτη; scholars from Farnell³⁸ onwards claim that Peitho is Aphrodite. The latter supposition is not too radical, given that Peitho and Aphrodite are consistently associated in poetry, Peitho often appears as a cult title of Aphrodite,³⁹ and of course there is a clear association here between beauty and persuasion. However, given Peitho’s separate identity in *Theogony* as a child of Thetis (Th. 349), and the lack of other such examples in epic of Peitho representing Aphrodite, it is much more feasible to explain this divergence in terms of both type scenes and elaboration. This is a ‘dressing-up’ *topos*:⁴⁰ see in particular Hom. Hymni 5.61–5, 6.5–13, Cypr. fr. 4, 5 (all of Aphrodite), Il. 14.170–221 (Hera). That this is an extended formula may account for Aphrodite’s

³⁷ Further examples include Heath (1985) 256 ‘this reduplication serving to ornament the account by displaying different aspects of the process in the execution and in the instructions’.

³⁸ Farnell (1896) 2.665.

³⁹ See LIMC s.v.

⁴⁰ See Brown (1997) 30–37 for a detailed discussion of the theme, including Near Eastern parallels. For similarity between Aphrodite and Pandora, primarily in their ambivalent natures, see Marquardt (1982) 285; she does not, however, address the role of type scenes here, noting only ‘Similar accounts of Aphrodite’s adornment...have become literary convention’.

disappearance – the Charites and Horai are her attendants, so it would usually be Aphrodite herself they were dressing, here replaced by Pandora. Note in particular the use at Hymni 5.88–9, 6.11 of the golden necklaces we see here at 74: they are worn by Aphrodite herself, in Hymni 5 to enchant Anchises, in Hymni 6 with the result that all the gods want to make her their wife⁴¹ – this use of the type scene draws attention to the divinely powerful and, most importantly, deceptive nature of the adornment.⁴² In fact, this *topos* as a whole is rarely without greater significance: Hera dresses to seduce and distract Zeus and so redirect the course of the Trojan War; Aphrodite⁴³ in *Cypr.* fr. 4 prepares for the Judgement of Paris which will spark off the war in the first place; Pandora will inaugurate the human condition.

As far as elaboration is concerned: first, why use one goddess when you can use three? Employing all of Aphrodite's entourage increases the number of gods involved in Pandora's creation, adding more spheres of influence and emphasising her importance. Second, Aphrodite, because of her association with appearances/love/sex, is arguably the most important and obvious god in Pandora's creation so her presence needs not be repeated. Third, the choice of retinue is particularly relevant. By extension of the dressing and adornment *topos*, the group (all together or in part) often appears in a marriage context:⁴⁴ grace is the quality of a bride, persuasion her allure, the 'seasons' the right time for a woman to marry. This is appropriate here because of Pandora's bride-like 'presentation' to Epimetheus. As already mentioned, Peitho is important here because of the seductive power of persuasion. The Horai are also pertinent to the Iron Age purpose of this myth: they are connected with things that are *ώραῖος* 'ripe', and are concerned with the works of mortals (*Th.* 903 αἱ τ' ἔργ' ὠρεύουσι κατανητοῖσι βροτοῖσι) so are particularly appropriate to *Works and Days* with its concern for timeliness and the works of men. And as for the Charites: at 65 Aphrodite is instructed to *χάριν ἀμφοιχέαι*, but she goes further, and has the command fulfilled by the very personifications of this *χάρις*.⁴⁵

⁴¹ The same type scene is used in the *Theogony* version, there also with the Woman's presentation to the gods (and men) as at Hymni 6.14–18.

⁴² Brown (1997) 37 'they represent not only the entirety of the woman's quasi-divine physical attractiveness (62, 65), but also the painful and dangerous emotions (66) this arouses.'

⁴³ Note that Aphrodite is the most frequent subject of this *topos*: in a Hesiodic context, her very birth connotes ideas of threat and even violence – see *Th.* 188–92 her birth from Ouranos' genitals after his castration by Kronos.

⁴⁴ See *Plu. Quest. Rom.* 2.264b; Pirenne-Delforge (1994) 421, Parker (2005) 440 n.87.

⁴⁵ Rowe (1983) 130 makes the insightful suggestion that we should not concentrate 'exclusively on the anthropomorphic aspect of Hesiod's divine figures, when this is only part of his conception. *χάρις* and *πειθώ* are simultaneously things that Pandora possesses, and the entities that give those things to her'.

At 61 Hephaistos is told to give Pandora αὐδή, at 79 Hermes gives her φωνή. Two main explanations have been proposed for this: first, that Hephaistos does not do as he is told so Hermes has to step in; second, that αὐδή and φωνή are different things, the former 'vocal apparatus' and the latter 'articulate speech'.⁴⁶ The first explanation is essentially problematic as it creates an inconsistency with 69–71 where we are told that Hephaistos did as he was ordered (this inconsistency led Bentley (in Goettling (1843) and Rzach to athetise 79). The second is more likely as it offers an explanation for the divergence between command and execution, without positing disobedience. However, a couple of points should be added here: firstly, this differentiation between the two words is not a given, as they seem to be synonymous at Th. 39–40,⁴⁷ and so we must look closely at their context. Secondly, at Th. 31 Hesiod is given αὐδή by the Muses: we must assume he already had some sort of 'vocal apparatus', so clearly the definition given above does not suffice. In the *Theogony* context we are supposed to understand some kind of 'special', poetic voice;⁴⁸ perhaps the word is used as a marked term also here, highlighting Hephaistos' ability to give life to his creations.⁴⁹ If αὐδή marks Hephaistos' particular contribution, it follows that φωνή distinguishes not just 'articulate speech' but Hermes' kind of articulate speech.⁵⁰ Verdenius comments 'It is only natural that Hermes as herald of the gods makes her speech sounding', however Hermes' φωνή could also refer to lies and wily words, which are in fact specified at 78. In this way, the use of vocabulary here emphasises the creative contribution made by the gods: they put into Pandora their own specialities. Hermes himself is cast in as many roles as possible in this passage, to give the impression of multiple gods from one. Hesiod explores the god's many epithets and the diversity of his spheres of influence: at 68 and 77 his association with theft and trickery (for which see further *Hymni* 4); at 80 his capacity as herald of the gods; at 85 his role as messenger god.

⁴⁶ West's definitions, but the explanation is propagated also by Σ(Op.)Pertusi 61d, 77–8, 77ab, 79–80, Mazon, Sinclair, Verdenius.

⁴⁷ Th. 39–40 φωνῇ ὁμηρεῦσαι, τῶν δ' ἀκάματος ῥέει αὐδῇ | ἐκ στομάτων ἤδεϊα.

⁴⁸ This 'special' quality must be built into the word αὐδή itself rather than just in the qualifying adjective θεσπας, as 'divine vocal apparatus' or indeed 'divine human voice' still does not convey the necessary meaning.

⁴⁹ See Il.18.419–20 Hephaistos' attendants, also given αὐδή.

⁵⁰ For Hermes as god of speech and named as such see e.g. Pl. Cra. 407e–408a ἀλλὰ μὴν τοῦτό γε ἔοικε περὶ λόγον τι εἶναι ὁ Ἑρμῆς, 'Well then, this name "Hermes" seems to me to have to do with speech' (Text and translation: Fowler 1977); D.S. 1.16.1–2 ὑπὸ γὰρ τούτου πρῶτον μὲν τήν τε κοινὴν διάλεκτον δαρθρωθῆναι 'It was by Hermes, for instance, according to them [sc. the Greeks] that the common language of mankind was first further articulated' (Text and translation Oldfather 1968).

At 80–81 Pandora’s name is added and glossed with 82 δῶρον ἐδώρησαν.⁵¹ As discussed above, this naming of the Woman left unnamed in *Theogony* is part of the increased focus on Pandora as a figure in her own right in *Works and Days*. However, the phrase δῶρον ἐδώρησαν is ambiguous and widely debated as it could mean either ‘gave her a gift’ or the heavily ironic ‘gave her as a gift’. This debate is not a modern one, but was circulating already in the scholia: the scholiast at Σ(Op.)Pertusi 81 sets out the two possibilities⁵² (ἢ ὅτι πάντων δῶρα ἔλαβεν ἢ ὅτι δῶρον πάντων τῶν θεῶν), whilst Σ(Op.)Pertusi 82 opts for ‘gave her a gift’ on the grounds that at 84 it is Zeus alone who sends her to Epimetheus. Understanding the divergences between command and execution as expressing the gods’ creative contributions seemed to me at first consideration to hint at the former interpretation: however, Clay follows similar logic but arrives at the opposite conclusion.⁵³ This ambiguity is not problematic: on the contrary, it fits with Hesiod’s penchant for riddle language and multiplicity.⁵⁴

The final problem with the *Works and Days* Pandora myth is the widely debated⁵⁵ passage 94–9, in which Elpis (most often translated as Hope) is kept in Pandora’s jar after its evils have been released upon mankind. I hope to show that this passage too can be explained in terms of elaboration.

ἀλλὰ γυνὴ χεῖρεσσι πίθου μέγα πῶμ’ ἀφελοῦσα
ἐσκέδασ’· ἀνθρώποισι δ’ ἐμήσατο κῆδεα λυγρά.
μούνῃ δ’ αὐτόθι Ἑλπίς ἐν ἀρρήκτοισι δόμοισιν
ἔνδον ἔμιμνε πίθου ὑπὸ χεῖλεσιν, οὐδὲ θύραζε
ἐξέπτῃ· πρόσθεν γάρ ἐπέμβαλε πῶμα πίθοιο
αἰγιόχου βουλῇσι Διὸς νεφεληγερέταο.

95

⁵¹ Πανδῶρην inverts the customary epithet of ‘all-giving’ Gaia: Ar. Av. 971, Zeitlin (1996) 60, Clay (2009) 77. Clay (2003) 123: ‘ambiguous as she is promising all, but in reality all-consuming’. Pandora is also known as the name of a chthonic Earth-goddess: see West (1978) and Farnell (1896) 1.290 for further discussion and references. For other Hesiod ‘wordplay’ etymologies see e.g. Th. 195–200 Aphrodite, Th. 207–10 Titans, Op. 3 Zeus. For more on the wordplay in Op. 80–85 see Mazur (2004), for Hesiod the etymologist see Koning (2010b).

⁵² For a third, though far less convincing, possibility, see Lehrs (1837): he considers 81–2 to be a later addition and suggests 80 ὀνόμηνε δὲ τήνδε γυναῖκα originally meant ‘he named her woman’.

⁵³ Clay (2003) 120.

⁵⁴ For Hesiod’s riddle language see e.g. 40–41 νήπιοι, οὐδὲ ἴσασιν ὅσῳ πλέον ἤμισυ παντός, | οὐδ’ ὅσον ἐν μαλ’ ἄλλῃ τε καὶ ἀσφοδέλῳ μέγ’ ὄνειρα. ‘fools, they do not know how much more the half is than the whole, nor how great is the benefit in mallow and asphodel’, or kennings such as 524 ὅτ’ ἀνόστεος ὄν πόδα τένδει ‘when the boneless one gnaws his foot’. On Hesiod’s use of multiplicity and plurality see later on elpis.

⁵⁵ See esp. Walcot (1961b), Beall (1989), Byrne (1998), Zarecki (2007) 19–26.

But the woman removed the great lid from the jar with her hands, and scattered; and she contrived baneful cares for men. Expectation alone remained there inside in the unbreakable dwelling, under the lip of the jar, and did not fly out. For before it could she replaced the lid of the jar, by the plans of aegis-bearing cloud-gathering Zeus.

These lines have been approached in many different ways: to give just a few diverse examples, Marquardt (1982) sees the *pithos* as a metaphor for the earth and *elpis* as equivalent to Good Eris buried in the earth; Beall (1989) shows how the 'alternative' version told in a fable of Babrius can map on to the Hesiod account;⁵⁶ D. and E. Panofsky (1956) explore the motif of Pandora's jar throughout literature and art. In this paper, however, I confine my analysis to close reading of the extant text, following the line of argument as it stands and showing how the interpretational issues can be resolved on the basis of the elaboration model I have offered. The main interpretational issues are: first, is *elpis* being kept in the jar for men (Mazon), or kept in *away* from men (Sinclair)? And second, is *elpis* good (Paley, Wilamowitz, Mazon, Sinclair, Vernant) or bad (Verdenius)?⁵⁷

The first step in resolving these dilemmas is to find an accurate definition of ἐλπίς. Although it is usually translated as 'hope', it is more accurately 'expectation'⁵⁸ or 'anticipation'⁵⁹ because of its ambiguous usage: it is vain at *Op.* 498 (the idle man has nothing but empty *elpis*) and 500 (*elpis* is not good when it accompanies a man in want); it is temporarily vain in *Hymni* 2.37; it is justified in *Odyssey* (16.101, 19.84); it is left equivocal at for example *Pl. Lg.* 644c, *Thgn.* 1135–6. Since the meaning of *elpis* is itself ambiguous (expectation of either good or bad), I suggest so is this scenario.

It is generally accepted that the containment of *elpis* contrasts with the release of evils (95–7 ἐσκέδασ'...ἐνδον ἔμμενε), and so should be interpreted as a positive act on the part of Zeus through Pandora's agency. The containment itself has been criticised because of this dual initiative: at 98 textual variants on ἐπέμβαλε⁶⁰ can be explained

⁵⁶ See e.g. Verdenius (1971), (1980) for an opposing view.

⁵⁷ For a clear outline of different interpretative combinations see *LfgE sub voc.*, Verdenius *ad loc.*; for a more recent review of proposed explanations see Musäus (2004) 13–30.

⁵⁸ Beall (1989).

⁵⁹ Most (2006).

⁶⁰ Some mss. have instead ἐπέβαλε, others have ἐπέλ(λ)αβε.

either in mechanical terms or due to attempts to remove a supposed contradiction between the initiative of Pandora and the initiative of Zeus (i.e. by making the $\pi\omega\mu\alpha$, rather than Pandora, the subject). Similarly Σ(Op.)Pertusi 98e tries to take the verb intransitively; Plutarch omits 99, which is bracketed also by Wilamowitz and Solmsen. In any case, from the text as it stands we are left with two interpretative possibilities.

First: *elpis* is good and keeping it in the jar means keeping it for men. *Elpis* is good in the sense that it can help mankind understand their own human condition: it distinguishes men from omniscient gods who have no need for expectation, and men from beasts which are unaware of their own mortality.⁶¹ It also defines the Iron Age in which we live, where good things are mixed with evils (Op. 179 $\xi\mu\pi\eta\varsigma$ καὶ τοῖσι μεμειξεται ἐσθλὰ κακοῖσιν): we are past the Golden Age, where everything was good so we did not expect evil (106–26, 90–92), but we have not yet reached the apocalyptic time which Hesiod describes at 180–201, in which everything will be evil so we will not expect good. In support of *elpis* being kept for men, the fact that it appears elsewhere in *Works and Days* (at 498 and 500) shows that it is indeed accessible to men.

On the other hand, we have the possibility that *elpis* is bad and keeping it in the jar means keeping it away from men. Notably, *elpis* is present in a jar of evils. If Hesiod is following the same tradition as Homer at Il. 24.527–8,⁶² where Zeus has two clearly differentiated jars, one of evils and one of goods, then we would be forced to conclude that *elpis* is a negative.⁶³ Also at 100 we have the formulation ἄλλα δὲ μυρία λυγρά – for there to be ‘other’ evils there must be an initial one which, in the context, should be *elpis*.⁶⁴ In support of *elpis* being kept away from men is the logical progression that if evils are present for men because they leave the jar, *elpis* being in the jar must mean it is kept away from men.

As is evident from this two-sided discussion, the narrative does support both possibilities to a certain extent, which is why the passage is often criticised as inconsistent. However, it is crucial here to remember Hesiod’s use elsewhere of ambiguity and multiplicity.⁶⁵ This often takes the form of explicit duality: we have the contrasting pairs of the Good Eris and the Bad Eris, wise farmer/teacher Hesiod and idle brother Perses, forward-thinking Prometheus and slow brother Epimetheus, the

⁶¹ Vernant (1980) 184.

⁶² For ancient discussion see Σ(II)Erbse 24.527–8a and bT, Σ(Op.)Pertusi 94a, Plu. *Moralia* 105D.

⁶³ Pace Zarecki (2007) 24 who takes this passage and draws the opposite conclusion: he notes ‘Zeus often mixes the good with the bad’, but Zeus does this from two differentiated jars, not inside one jar.

⁶⁴ For other interpretations see e.g. Hays (1918) 89–90, West (1978) *ad loc.*, Zarecki (2007) 22.

⁶⁵ See further Rowe (1983) 129–30, Martin (2004).

mighty hawk and the vulnerable nightingale.⁶⁶ However, just as often it manifests itself in one concept or character having multiple aspects: we have seen the multiple spheres of Hermes, elsewhere in *Works and Days* concepts such as *aidōs* 317–19 (shame sometimes helps, sometimes harms) and *Phēmē* 761–4 (Rumour is light and easy to pick up, but hard to bear, and difficult to get rid of) are given ambivalent natures. There are even more multiplicities between Hesiod's two poems: for example at Th. 223 Nemesis was *πῆμα θνητοῖσι βροτοῖσι*, but at Op. 200–202 her leaving mortals is what causes the trouble. In the passage with which I am primarily concerned in this paper, the importance of multiplicity is clear: Pandora is the *καλὸν κακόν* (Th. 585), with a beautiful appearance, a lovely voice, but a terrible nature. I posit that the nature of *elpis* correlates with that of Pandora,⁶⁷ ambivalent and multiple, and that it is part of Hesiod's intentional manipulation of ambiguities; a multiple concept which is in one sense good for men and in one sense bad, having both to be preserved for men and restricted from men.

This issue of *elpis*, and the hypothesis I have offered, epitomises on the level of detail the main issues of this paper. This idea of multiplicity, so linked as it is with the plurality we saw with Aphrodite's replacement by her entourage or the use of many epithets for one god (Hermes), contributes to the sense of elaboration. Plurality gives the impression of many from one: creating a crowd scene from a few characters, or adding more and more components of a story from one telling to the next. Multiplicity is particularly relevant to this myth, as Pandora creates for the first time uncertainty among men (in sexual, procreative and economic terms), and this uncertainty is reflected in the double-edged terms used to describe her.

In conclusion, we have then a programme of elaboration which acts first on an intertextual level, expanding on *Theogony* with which I have shown *Works and Days* to operate in conjunction, and, second, intratextually, enacting an expansion of the expansion within *Works and Days*. The implications for textual issues are essentially conservative. In working on the Hesiodic corpus one of course encounters many textual difficulties which need to be resolved, sometimes by means of conjecture, athetesis or emendation:⁶⁸ however, the issues I have addressed in this paper are not

⁶⁶ I argue (along with Nelson 1997) that the fable itself has multiple meanings: Hesiod is explicitly addressing the kings (202) and Perses (213), and implicitly teaching the whole Iron Race, so he creates a fable which can be applied by each to their current situation: whether you are a hawk or a nightingale, you must consider the implications of the story for yourself (202 *φρονέουσιν*), decode it and get advice.

⁶⁷ See Vernant (1980) 184 for a comparison between *elpis* and Pandora, and similarly Zarecki (2007) and Marquardt (1982) 290–91 for connections between Pandora and Eris.

⁶⁸ Indeed in this very passage 93 should be omitted as it has been interpolated from Hom. Od. 19.360.

of this sort. To be resolved they require primarily an understanding of the relationship between *Theogony* and *Works and Days*, and Hesiod's respective purpose in each. As I have shown, all these points of 'difficulty' can be explained in terms of elaboration of the role of Pandora in *Works and Days*; she is of greater importance to this Iron Age poem than to *Theogony*. After all, the Iron Age is characterised by the need to work, a need both created and threatened by women's deception: as Hesiod advises at 373-4,⁶⁹ 'Don't let a woman with a tarded-up arse deceive your mind with cajoling words while she rifles round in your granary'.

LILAH-GRACE FRASER
DURHAM UNIVERSITY

⁶⁹μηδὲ γυνή σε νόον πυγοστόλος ἐξαπατάτω| αἰμύλα κωτύλλουσα, τεῆν διφῶσα καλιήν.

WORKS CITED

- Allen, T. W. (1915) 'The date of Hesiod', *JHS*, 35, 85–99.
- Arrighetti, G. (1998) *Esiado: Opere*, Turin.
- Beall, E. F. (1989) 'The contents of Hesiod's Pandora jar: *Erga* 94–98', *Hermes* 117.2, 227–30.
- Blümer, W. (2001) *Interpretation archaischer Dichtung. Die mythologischen Partien der Erga Hesiods*, Münster.
- Brown, A. (1997) 'Aphrodite and the Pandora Complex', *CQ* 47.1, 26–47.
- Byrne, S. (1998) 'Ἑλπίς in *Works and Days* 90–105', *SyllClass* 9, 37–46.
- Clay, J. S. (2003) *Hesiod's Cosmos*, Cambridge.
- (2009) 'Works and Days: tracing the path to Arete', in F. Montanari, A. Rengakos, C. Tsagalis (eds.) *Brill's Companion to Hesiod*, Leiden, 71–90.
- Farnell, L. R. (1896) *The cults of the Greek states vols. I, 2*, Oxford.
- Goettling, C. (1843) *Hesiodi Carmina*, London.
- Graziosi, B., Haubold, J. (2005) *Homer: the resonance of epic*, London.
- Haubold, J. (2010) 'Shepherd, farmer, poet, sophist: Hesiod on his own reception' in G. Boys-Stones, J. Haubold (eds.) *Plato and Hesiod*, Oxford, 11–30.
- Hays, H. B. (1918) *Notes on the Works and Days of Hesiod*, Chicago.
- Heath, M. (1985) 'Hesiod's didactic poetry', *CQ* 35.2, 245–63.
- Heitsch, E. (1963) 'Das Prometheus-Gedicht bei Hesiod', *RhM* 115.
- Kirchhoff, A. (1889) *Hesiodos' Mahnlieder an Perses*, Berlin.
- Koning, H. (2010a) 'Plato's Hesiod: not Plato's alone', in G. Boys-Stones, J. Haubold (eds.) *Plato and Hesiod*, Oxford, 89–110.
- (2010b) *Hesiod: the Other Poet*, Leiden.
- Lehrs, K. (1837) *Quaestiones Epicae, Regimontii Prussorum*.
- Lendle, O. (1957) *Die Pandorasage bei Hesiod*, Würzburg.
- Lisco, E. (1903) *Quaestiones Hesiodae criticae et mythologicae*, Göttingen.
- Marquardt, P. (1982) 'Hesiod's ambiguous view of women', *CPh* 77, 283–91.
- Martin, R. (2004) 'Hesiod and the didactic double', *Synthesis* 11, 31–54.
- Mazon, P. (1914) *Les Travaux et les Jours*, Paris.
- Mazur, P. S. (2004) 'Παρονομασία in Hesiod *Works and Days* 80–85', *CPh* 99.3, 243–6.
- Mondi, R. (1986) 'Tradition and innovation in the Hesiodic Titanomachy', *TAPhA* 116, 25–48.
- Most, G. (1993) 'Hesiod and the textualization of personal temporality', in G. Arrighetti and F. Montanari (eds.) *La componente autobiografica nella poesia greca e latina fra realtà e artificio letterario*, Pisa, 73–92.
- (2006) *Hesiod: Theogony, Works and Days, Testimonia*, Harvard.

- (2008) 'Two Hesiodic papyri' in G. Bastianini, A. Casanova (eds.) *Esiodo: cent'anni di papiri*, Florence, 55–70.
- Musäus, I. (2004) *Der Pandoramythos bei Hesiod und seine Rezeption bis Erasmus von Rotterdam*, Göttingen.
- Nelson, S. (1997) 'The justice of Zeus in Hesiod's fable of the hawk and the nightingale', *CJ* 92, 235–47.
- Oldfather, C. H. (1968) *Diodorus of Sicily in twelve volumes I: Books I and II Ch.1–34*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Paley, F. A. (1861) *The epics of Hesiod*, London.
- Panofsky, D. and E. (1956) *Pandora's box: the changing aspects of a mythical symbol*, New York.
- Parker, R. (2005) *Polytheism and society at Athens*, Oxford.
- Pertusi, A. (1955) (ed.) *Scholia vetera in Hesiodi Opera et Dies*, Milan.
- Pirenne-Delforge, V. (1994) *L'Aphrodite grecque: contribution à l'étude de ses cultes et de sa personnalité dans le panthéon archaïque et classique*, *Kernos Supplement* 4, Athens.
- Pucci (2009) in F. Montanari, A. Rengakos, C. Tsagalis (eds.) *Brill's Companion to Hesiod*, Leiden, 37–70.
- Rowe, C. (1983) "'Archaic thought" in Hesiod', *JHS* 103, 124–35.
- Rzach, A. (1958) *Hesiodi carmina*, (3rd. edn.) Stuttgart.
- Sinclair, T. A. (1932) *Hesiod Works and Days*, London.
- Solmsen, F. (1949) *Hesiod and Aeschylus*, Cornell.
- Solmsen, F., Merkelbach, R., West, M. L. (1990) *Hesiodi Theogonia, Opera et Dies, Scutum, Fragmenta Selecta*, (3rd. edn.) Oxford.
- Sussman, L. S. (1978) 'Workers and drones: labor, idleness and gender definition in Hesiod's beehive', *Arethusa* 11, 27–41.
- Twisten, A. (1815) *Commentatio critica de Hesiodi carmine quod inscribitur Opera et Dies*, Kiel.
- Verdenius, W. J. (1971) 'A "hopeless" line in Hesiod, *Works and Days* 96', *Mnemosyne* 24, 225–31.
- (1980) *A Commentary on Hesiod Works and Days vv.1–382*, Leiden.
- Vernant, J. P. (1980) transl. J. Lloyd, *Myth and society in ancient Greece*, Sussex.
- Walcot, P. (1961a) 'The composition of the *Works and Days*', *REG* 74, 1–19.
- (1961b) 'Pandora's jar, *Erga* 83–105', *Hermes* 89, 249–51.
- (1966) *Hesiod and the Near East*, Cardiff.
- West, M. L. (1966) *Hesiod Theogony*, Oxford.
- (1978) *Hesiod Works and Days*, Oxford.
- Wickkiser, B. L. (2010) 'Hesiod and the fabricated woman: poetry and visual art in the *Theogony*', *Mnemosyne* 63, 557–76.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von (1928) *Hesiodos' Erga*, Berlin.

Wolkow, B. M. (2007) 'The mind of a bitch: Pandora's motive and intent in the *Erga*', *Hermes* 135, 247–62.

Zarecki, J. P. (2007) 'Pandora and the good Eris in Hesiod', *GRBS* 47, 5–29.

Zeitlin, F. (1996) *Playing the other: gender and society in classical Greek literature*, Chicago.